



EXPRESS MAIL NO. EV 614 652 856 US

<b>RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT</b>  Address to: Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	Attorney Docket No.	RIGL-047
	Confirmation No.	6779
	First Named Inventor	ROSSI, ALEXANDER B.
	Application Number	10/524,233
	Filing Date	August 25, 2005
	Group Art Unit	1644
	Examiner Name	BELYAVSKYI, MICHAIL A
	Title:	"METHODS OF IDENTIFYING COMPOUNDS THAT MODULATE IGG MEDIATED MAST CELL ACTIVATION"

Sir:

This communication is submitted in response to the Restriction Requirement dated May 30, 2007. This communication requests reconsideration of the Examiner's requirement for restriction in this case. A petition to the Director requesting reconsideration of the Restriction Requirement accompanies this communication.

In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner required election of one of the following groups of claims:

- Group I, i.e., Claims 1-10;
- Group II, i.e., Claims 11-20; or
- Group III, i.e., claims 21-30

for further prosecution in this application.

The Applicants hereby elect **Group I**, with traverse.

The instant application is an international application that entered the US via 35 U.S.C. § 371. The restriction of claims in this application is therefore governed by PCT Rule 13.1 (via 37 C.F.R. § 1.475). PCT Rule 13.1 is elaborated in great detail in MPEP §§ 1893.03(d) and 1850.

According to PCT Rule 13.1, the Applicant has a right to pursue, in one application, all inventions that are linked by a single inventive concept.

In this application, the claims are linked by a single inventive concept, namely the use of primed mast cells to identify modulators of Fcγ receptor signaling.

Since the use of primed mast cells to identify modulators of Fcγ receptor signaling is recited in each of the claims, the Applicants submit that the claims of this case are linked by a single inventive concept. Thus, the Applicants believe that the requirements of PCT Rule 13.1 have been met, and this Restriction Requirement should be withdrawn.

In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner has not set forth any reasoning to support the conclusion that the instant claims should be restricted under PCT Rule 13.1. As such, this Restriction Requirement lacks force.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the Applicants request rejoinder of claims 1-30. A decision to rejoin claims 1-30 would be consistent with the International Preliminary Examination Report of August 18, 2004, in which no lack of unity rejection is issued, and all claims are examined. The Applicants note that the same examiner (Exr. Belyavskiy) authored this IPER and this Restriction Requirement.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required by this paper, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0815, order number RIGL-047.

Respectfully submitted,  
BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP

Date: June 21, 2007

By: 

James S. Keddie, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 48,920

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP  
1900 University Avenue, Suite 200  
East Palo Alto, California 94303  
Telephone: (650) 327-3400  
Facsimile: (650) 327-3231